DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 584 RC 009 918

AUTHOR	Forbes, Jack D.
TITLE	Racism, Scholarship and Cultural Pluralism in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Davis. Tecumseh Center.
PUB DATE	Mar 77
NOTE	41p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Native American Studies, University of California at Davis, Temporary Building 113, Davis, California 95616 ($0.90)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Ability; *American Indians; Bias; College Segregation; *Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Disadvantagement; Educational History; Educational Trends; Ethnic Status; Faculty Promotion; Futures (of Society); *Higher Education; Personnel Integration; Power Structure; *Racism; Role Conflict; School Role; Tenure; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	California; University of California

ABSTRACT

Education cannot be discussed apart from the social conditions surrounding it, since the school is not immune from cultural, economic, political, or class considerations. Therefore, it is extremely important to keep in mind the historical and contemporary circumstances which, in large measure, determine the function, purpose, and style of any given university or college. Thus, the struggle for racial justice in higher education aims to alter the mission, curricula, and values of the university so as to make it a culturally plural, non-racist institution. Exploratory and tentative in nature, this monograph examines the abyss which separates the perceptions and feelings of most non-whites, especially of Native Americans, from those of the dominant white elite in higher education. Topics include: the development of a mono-cultural university (e.g., the University of California); segregation and bias in institutions of higher education; ethnicity and academic life; research, scholarship and ethnic bias; the faculty's ethnicity, their creative products, and their promotion; and the future of minority groups in higher education. (NQ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

904
ED139584

Racism, Scholarship and Cultural Pluralism in Higher Education

Jack D. Forbes

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Native American Studies
Tecumseh Center
University of California
Davis, California 95616

March 1977

2

RC009918

Racism, Scholarship and Cultural Pluralism in Higher Education

Jack D. Forbes

Native American Studies
Tecumseh Center
University of California
Davis, California

Preface

This study is exploratory and tentative in nature. Many readers may find offense in much that is said, but hopefully they will come to realize that my purpose is not to attack anyone but, rather, to contribute to new understandings.

The abyss which separates the perceptions and feelings of most nonwhites from those of the dominant white elite is both deep and enduring. Nowhere is this truer than in relation to the subject of higher education. White professors and administrators, by and large, are oblivious to this gulf. The fundamental cause of this ignorance is ethnic chauvinism on the part of the white elite (in my opinion) and this very ethnic chauvinism is also one of the factors determining the racist character of most universities and colleges.

Ignorance is also perpetuated by the fact that although most Chicano, black, and Native American faculty are suspicious of, and bitter or resentful towards, white faculty and administrators, they are usually compelled to hide their feelings behind a mask of collegiality. The economic and power relationship of the minority faculty person to the white faculty is usually the same as that of a black sharecropper to a white farm owner, that is, one of economic and power inferiority.

Minority faculty often give vent to feelings of extreme hostility and bitterness towards the white elite in minority settings, but all too often these feelings must be suppressed in a department where the minority professor may be the only non-white and, more often than not, lacks tenure as well.

In any case, I have been observing this gulf for 25 years, as a student, professor, and administrator. I hope that some of the observations expressed here will help people to at least understand the breadth of the abyss, if not to take steps to bridge it.

I have chosen to focus my attention upon those colleges with which I am most familiar, especially the University of California. This does not mean, however, that I regard the University of California as either especially unique or negligent. I am quite sure that many colleges in other sections of this land are, in fact, much worse.

In truth, California is one of the better states insofar as the development of so-called "ethnic studies" is concerned as well as in the integration of students of diverse races. For example, we possess perhaps the largest and most fully developed Native American Studies program in the United States on the Davis campus of the University of California campuses. Several other University of California campuses, several California State University campuses, and one or two community colleges also have course offerings of some extent in Native Studies. By way of contrast many universities and colleges in states with large Indian populations (such as Oklahoma, Arizona, New Mexico, the Dakotas, and so on) have refused to allow the development of Native American Studies or have very carefully installed non-Indian Administrators and professors in charge of so-called Indian programs designed primarily to secure federal dollars for the campus or to "head off" any Indian-controlled program.

In many states, such as Virginia where my own tribe has its home, one cannot even speak of more than token non-white studies or non-white faculty except in a few black colleges.

In short, if I seem to bear down heavily at times on the University of California it is not because I am singling it out as the worst system of higher education. On the contrary, I believe that the University of California is worth using as a focus for analysis precisely because it probably is one of the best, and still is, in spite of that, a mono-cultural institution.

Some readers may find certain aspects of this work "subjective," being based in part upon my own personal experiences and observations. I do not, however, apologize

for that since one's own direct experience is always a valuable, even irreplaceable, resource. Whether it is "subjective" or "objective" depends upon its use and how it is handled, not upon its origin.

It is my intention that these thoughts be used constructively, to the end that all of our many peoples may find joy, relevance, and meaning in that part of their lives which intersects with higher education.

Jack D. Forbes

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	4
II.	Part One: Racism and Colonialism in the History of Universities	6
	A. The Development of a Mono-Cultural University: The Example of the University of California	7
	B. Segregation and Bias	10
	C. Ethnicity and Academic Life	12
III.	Part Two: Racism, Scholarship, and Tenure	21
	A. Research, Scholarship and Ethnic Bias	22
	B. Ethnicity, Products, and Promotion	25
	C. Wisdom and New Knowledge	32
	D. Looking to the Future	36

Introduction

Black Elk, the noted Oglala Lakota "professor of wisdom," has told us that "the power of an act or a thing is in the meaning and the understanding." We can go through the forms of praying, sacrificing, learning, teaching, researching, or whatever, but there is no "power" in what we do, nor any positive value, unless we understand fully what we are doing and why we are doing it. We must also have an understanding of our intentions and our motives, and they must be one with the task we are undertaking and the goals we are supposedly seeking.

Understanding and meaning have to do with wisdom and it is Wisdom that is truly the goal of "higher" education. "Technical expertise" is, it seems to me, essentially an extension of learning to spell, and is of considerably less significance.

The Navajo elders have created a set of guidelines for the development of modern Navajo education, by means of a drawing. This picture shows a cornstalk, fully developed, growing in the earth. It represents the human being. It's roots stand for an understanding of one's identity - one's family, clan, tribe, and so on, but even more than that, one's relationship with the earth, the sun, the air, the water, and all other living creatures.

Going up through the center of the cornstalk is a line which represents its core or, in the human, one's continual spiritual and ethical growth. Without that core and without deep and healthy roots there will be no fruit on the cornstalk, and the human being will produce only deformed products.

The cornstalk has leaves and ears of corn which represent specific skills, technical knowledge, and the products thereof. But these skills can be used for evil purposes if the core is lacking, and the fruit will be, like nuclear weapons, dangerous and destructive.

The pollen at the top of the cornstalk represents purity, harmony, health, and all that is sacred. A person who grows like that cornstalk is a fully-developed human being, a Navajo (for example) who knows his relationships to others and who has mastered skills which he uses for the benefit of all living things.

All too often we in so-called "higher" education are concerned merely with trying to get cornstalks to bear fruit without having either roots or cores. And we are so successful in producing technically competent scientists, researchers, executives, and so on, who possess little wisdom and fewer ethics and who seem to be willing participants in destruction and exploitation. What our graduates do often has no meaning nor is there any understanding.

Carlos Castaneda told Juan Matus, the Yaqui nagualli, about an old white friend of his who, although quite wealthy, was dying without having any meaning in his life. Juan responded to Carlos, saying:

> Your friend is lonely because he will die without seeing. In his life he just grew old and now he must have more self-pity than ever before. He feels he threw away forty years because he was after victories and found only defeats. He'll never know that to be victorious or to be defeated are equal. . .
>
> Our lot as men is to learn and one goes to knowledge as one goes to war. . . .And so you're afraid of the emptiness of your friend's life. But there's no emptiness in the life of a man of knowledge, I tell you. Everything is filled to the brim. . . .I am not like your friend who just grew old. . . . For him, his struggle was not worth his while, because he was defeated; for me there is no victory, or defeat, or emptiness. Everything is filled to the brim and everything is equal and my struggle was worth my while. . . (Carlos Castaneda, A Separate Reality, New York, 1972, p. 88).

An ancient Mexican poem states:

Those of the white hair and the wrinkled faces;
Our ancestors. . . .
They did not come here to be arrogant;
They were not seeking;
They were not greedy.
They were such that they were highly esteemed on earth;
They came to be eagles and jaguars.
(from Miguel Leon-Portilla, Aztec Thought and Culture, pp. 168-9)

Perhaps one of the inherent problems with European-American higher education consists in the fact that European overseas cultures (whether in North America, South Africa, or Australia) have very much encouraged people to be arrogant, to be greedy, and to be seeking after material things. Could it be that the very history, motivation, and dynamics of European imperialism makes "higher" education a culturally-incompatible ideal? If so, then the admission of non-white heritages and perspectives into the university may well be an absolute necessity if there is to be any truly meaningful, humanizing, and "liberal" education in this part of the twentieth-century.

Does this path have a heart? If it does, the path is good; if it doesn't, it is of no use. Both paths lead nowhere; but one has a heart, the other doesn't. One makes for a joyful journey, as long as you follow it, you are one with it. The other will make you curse your life. One makes you strong; the other weakens you.
(Juan Matus, in Carlos Castaneda, The Teachings of Don Juan, pp. 105-106)

Part One:

Racism and Colonialism in the History of Universities

The Development of A Mono-Cultural University:

The Example of the University of California

Some people seem to feel that one can discuss education apart from the social conditions surrounding it, as if the school is an institution immune from cultural, economic, political, or class considerations. Quite obviously such is not the case.

It is extremely important that we who choose to look at higher education today keep ever in mind the historical and contemporary circumstances which, in large measure, determine the function, purpose, and style of any given university or college. More precisely, we must open our eyes to the close relationship existing between expanding white imperialism and the rise of the white university.

Almost as soon as European troops have established control over a given area, and as soon as some white colonists have moved in, the college, university, or technical school appears. But the white university does not appear simply behind the frontier and thereafter grows up indifferent to that border. Quite the contrary, the university serves the internal needs of the colonist's society and participates both in the consolidation of the new conquest and in the preparation for new adventures in imperialism.

Thus, for example, white colleges and universities in the slave states of the United States both strengthened the ability of the white elite to rule that area and at the same time created (or helped to create) an intellectual climate extremely hostile to the conquered African and Native American populations, the "people of color."

The field of history, for instance, is a very useful ethno-political enterprise. Historians drawn from the ranks of the ruling colonial elite are able, by writing biased treatises, to contribute to the creation of an elaborate historical mythology supporting the pretensions of the imperialists and denigrating the conquered Indians and Blacks. Tragically, European-American historiography is largely still at the service of white ethnic interests, in the South and elsewhere.

In any case, universities and their professors have played a definite role in the European conquest of the Americas and in the perpetuation of Overseas European heritages. Let us look at the creation of the University of California from this perspective, by way of example.

California was a newly-invaded, still-being-conquered region in the 1860's when its University was first chartered. A number of Native American nations, including the Karok, the Modoc, and the Owens Valley Paiute, had not yet been finally subdued or were just being conquered. English-speaking persons had only just seized the coastal region from Mexicans and Indians some few years earlier and the process of liquidating, enslaving, and subduing Native Americans was continuous all during the 1850's and 1860's. The first buildings were being used on the Berkeley campus in 1873, the same year in which the Modoc people were making a last effort to defend their homeland in the northern part of the state.

The 1849 California State Constitutional Convention was a racist, invader-controlled body which illegally deprived peoples of Native and African race of their rights to citizenship, voting, and holding public office.* The State of California, as a defacto government, then commenced operations under its discriminatory constitution even prior to legal admission as a state. Persons of non-white background were never represented by this government, the government which chartered the University of California.

---

*The 1849 Constitution violated the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo between the U.S. and Mexico.

At the time the University commenced operations the following things were also true: (1) Native People were being enslaved and sold (in California); (2) Native People and Blacks (as well as Asians by legal interpretation) were not allowed to vote, hold office, serve in juries, or testify in matters involving white persons; (3) Native People were steadily being murdered or exterminated by enforced starvation and malnutrition (82,000 or so dying between 1850 and 1880); (4) Whites were continuously seizing Indian land; (5) Blacks, Indians, and Asians were generally excluded from white schools; (6) non-whites were prevented, ordinarily, from acquiring or retaining title to land; and (7) many gainful occupations were closed to non-whites except when serving as cheap labor.

There can be no question whatsoever but what the University of California was established as a "White Man's College" and, to be precise, as a college for English-speaking whites. Legally and/or operationally the University was closed to non-white and Spanish-speaking students or faculty. More fundamentally, however, the University was a transplanted Atlantic Coast institution carrying with it the cultural legacy of Europe and of Europeanized eastern America.

The University of California, did not commence life, then, as a politically neutral, "culture-free" or culturally-neutral institution. It was born as a white, Europeanist mono-cultural agency, designed to serve a white Anglo-European audience. Significantly, it was to help Europeanize California intellectually, artistically, and educationally. (Of course, some writers might say it was created to "Americanize" the Pacific Slope, but that, of course, represents an impossible task given the fact that the Pacific Coast had already been a part of this American land for millions of years and had had Native American cultural traditions going back 30,000 or more years.)

We must, then, envision the University of California as an element in racial-cultural warfare, and as a significant component of an imperialist system. Armed troops and white terrorists were militarily bringing (or keeping) the non-whites under control. The discriminatory operations of government and society were also doing their share to ensure Anglo-European dominance of the wealth and politics of the state. But nonetheless, California was close to Mexico and had a sizeable, locally-concentrated, Mexican minority, it was on the Pacific facing the "hordes" of China and Asia, it was in the middle of "heathenish" Polynesian and Native American traditions, it was easily reachable by Chileans and other Latin Americans, it was separated from the United States proper by thousands of square miles of still-independent Sioux, Apache, Navajo, Comanche, Ute, and other native territory, and, finally, it was full of illiterate or semi-literate whites of "frontier" culture who (in spite of their over-all racism) sometimes married Mexican, Indian, and Hawaiian women and, especially in southern California, came under non-European cultural influence.

The white conquest of California, therefore, although reasonably secure in the 1860's, was not finalized. There were still the tasks of liquidating or suppressing the non-whites, keeping Asians and "free Negroes" out, and making sure that the white masses did not become separatistic or "Californianized." The University was created to import European and European-Atlantic Coast traditions so as to prevent the rise of a distinctive California melting-pot culture and to provide the pedagogical weapons needed to overcome Mexican, Native, and Asian-Pacific cultural traditions. Ultimately, the teachers trained by the University were to go forth as soldiers, either fighting for Overseas European culture in the public schools or becoming professors in other colleges designed to train still other teachers to go forth with Anglo racist guns verbally blazing. And then, too, the future writers of books, journalists, and other professionals were also to be trained in "the New England Way" so as to save California for the invaders.

There is no question but what the University of California and its sister colleges did their job well. They trained generations of racist white teachers, judges, lawyers, writers, etc., who did indeed succeed in Europeanizing virtually every public aspect of California life. The schools, for example, soon began to discard bi-lingual or Spanish-language instruction (after the 1870's) because Anglo-oriented teachers were taking over the instructional sphere and whites from the east were capturing control of all instruments of government including school boards.

Education, in an imperialist setting, is always a battleground. And the University of California soon became a cultural arms factory on the West Coast, producing weapon

after weapon to insure the destruction of non-European heritages and, at the same time, excluding non-Europeans from the ranks of professors, students, and, therefore, future professors and teachers.

It should not be at all surprising that a colonial university, created in a new colony for the benefit of the colonizer's children, excluded from its ranks the children of the conquered or disenfranchised. And much later, when it became necessary to admit non-whites as students, the University of California continued to adhere to the colonial model by forcing the non-whites to conform to an alien, Europeanist system. When the colonized are admitted to the colonizer's universities it is almost always to transform the former into functionaries who serve the interests and carry out the goals of the dominant population.

In all of these colonial characteristics the University of California was clearly not unique. Virtually all of the institutions of advanced study founded by the Spanish, Portuguese and English-speaking invaders of the Americas were of the same order. The universities founded in Peru, Guatemala, Virginia, and Massachusetts were all designed to transplant European ideas, educate people of European descent, and employ only instructors of European cultural and racial background. Natives were systematically excluded, except for a few persons of influential status or mixed-race, even when the university was initially partially financed for the purpose of educating Native Americans (as at Harvard and William and Mary). In any case, the few Native students admitted were either exposed to an entirely European curricula, were shunted off into grammar school programs (as at William and Mary), or the college was suppressed (as at Tlatelolco) when Native students began to progress "too far" and gave too much attention to Americanist studies.

It should also be stressed that the University of California and similar European-oriented institutions did not always self-consciously seek to be instruments of cultural warfare (although some did). They, rather, were simply created by people whose racism, cultural bias, or sense of imperialistic arrogance was so great that whatever institutions they created (whether courts, schools, legislative bodies, or whatever) were inevitably going to be mono-cultural and chauvinistic.

White people who used to visit the Berkeley campus of the University were always impressed by its great beauty, its creeks, its many trees, its fine buildings, and its "intellectual atmosphere." I think to non-whites, and especially to Native People and to Chicanos, it meant something else. For almost a century the University's beauty and intellectuality were not intended for non-whites (or for the poor generally). Still further, its beauty was financed by the theft of Native and Chicano land and resources. The University was built with blood-money, including money derived directly from the sale of 30,000 acres of confiscated California Indian land, as well as money derived from the exploitation of Chinese "coolies," Indian farm workers, and other non-white victims of oppression.

Again, this phenomena is not unique to the University of California. Money must be generated to provide for an institution of higher learning. Ultimately, that money will usually be extracted from the most oppressed classes who, of course, can never attend the institution. In Peru, Mexico, etcetera, the universities were financed by the labor of Native Yanakuna (landless near-slaves) working in the mines or in agriculture, by Indian peones, and by property directly stolen from Native communities. The wealthy "benefactors," the Crown, or the Viceroy might be publically thanked for their financial support but in fact they gave nothing of their own since all that they had was extracted from the conquered population.

Similarly the benefactors of the University of California (including the state itself) often merely "laundered" property stolen from Native Californians prior to passing it on to finance the education of whites. And "cheap labor" (even slave labor) was a factor in a large percentage of white California's private fortunes.

Of course, the colonial university was a mirror of the plantation of the slave-owner or the finca of the Spanish-speaking land-owner. The pianos, sofas, etcetera, in the "big house" were paid for by the labor of the peónes or slaves but they were never allowed to use what their unwilling labor had provided.

Segregation and Bias

During 1975 the Berkeley campus of the University of California displayed photographs of the library from the 1920's and 1930's. Many pictures showed large groups of students using the study rooms, card catalogues, reference room, etcetera, while others were of library staff during that same period and earlier. What is interesting (and sad) about these photographs is that they dramatically document the nearly all-white character of the Berkeley campus as late as the pre-World War II period. Not a single non-white can be identified in any of the photographs seen by this writer.

For practical purposes we can regard the University of California system as a segregated one until recently. Until the 1940's it was segregated in the following ways:

(1) First, it was part of a culturally-biased, discriminatory system of public education which prevented most non-whites from graduating from high school. The few who were high school graduates were then, for the most part, prevented from attending the University by the latter's admission policies or by financial problems.

(2) Second, the University's curricula, language of instruction, faculty, catalogue, architecture, building names, requirements, and objectives (in brief, the university's total "culture") represented but one sector of the state's population, that of English-speaking white people. Why would one expect that, for example, Native American persons would be attracted to such an institution? Virtually none of their race were employed as teachers, counselors, functionaries, or in any capacity except, perhaps, as janitors or groundsmen (and that rarely). And what good would it do for a native youngster to submit to four years of alien culture, on top of twelve years already spent in biased schools?

In the first one hundred years of its existence it is doubtful if more than one or two native California Indians ever graduated from the University of California, proof enough of the intolerable mono-culturalism and functional racism of the institution.

(3) The biased "culture" of the University not only functioned as a device to directly discourage non-white students but it also reflected the "mission" of the institution, which was to directly reinforce the white military conquest of California and to serve the economic system created by that conquest. Since most non-whites had no place in that economic system, except as peónes, or were perhaps not interested in becoming functionaries in an exploitative society, the University's program of studies would do them little good.

It should be stressed that the University of California was not (and is not) a culturally plural "democratic" institution. It was born in imperialism, served as a hand-maid for colonialism, and matured as an integral part of large-scale corporate capitalism. California was officially a bi-lingual state (English/Spanish) from 1849 to 1876 but the University was created as a mono-racial, mono-cultural, and mono-lingual institution. This fact, I think clearly, was not a result of mere oversight but was, in fact, a part of a policy to ensure the victory of Eastern Seaboard white values. The subsequent tendency of the University to serve the wealthy classes, corporate agriculture, and so on, is also, I believe, not fortuitous but, rather, is a result of (1) the control of the Regents by the wealthy classes, (2) the control of the state by the large corporations (the Southern Pacific machine until World War I and the Bank of America - Los Angeles Times - Standard Oil etcetera since then), and (3) the decision of University officials to ally themselves with the wealthy establishment in order to ensure the financial success and growth of the institution.

The support of the wealthy white power structure of the state enabled the University of California to hire "prestigious" faculty, build beautiful campuses, and expand into many new fields. In contrast, the "state colleges," more or less devoted to the training of teachers, social workers, etcetera (professions relating principally to the masses) have often had ugly or at least less expensive buildings, small offices, lower-salaried faculty, heavier-teaching loads, and restrictions on entering "prestige" fields (such as law, medicine, doctoral studies, etcetera).

It is no mere result of chance that the state of California's higher educational system becomes noticeably more Chicano, Indian, and Black as one moves from the University to the state colleges (now the State University) and finally to the junior colleges. This is, of course, a result of economics in part, but not the kind of economics one might normally think of (i.e., tuition or fees). If the University costs more to attend that is a result of the University's own decision-making, since all systems are supported by tax dollars and there is no a priori reason for higher fees in one than in another.

The University of California was, and is, more expensive to attend because of conscious decision-making by the Regents and administration. These decisions include: (1) creating park-like campuses in rural or suburban settings (near White populated centers, i.e., Irvine, Santa Cruz, LaJolla, Westwood, Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside. Minorities have since moved nearer to the Berkeley and Westwood campuses). The location of these campuses usually required dormitory or apartment residence, (2) the decision to impose higher fees than was true for other units; (3) the decisions to spend funds for expensive buildings, stadiums, and student union areas (paid for by "gifts" or by mandatory student fees) rather than for free textbooks, scholarship aid, etcetera; (4) the choices made in relation to what areas to try to raise money for, from alumni, corporations, and wealthy benefactors, e.g., raising funds for an athletic complex at Davis rather than raising funds for minority or low-income financial aid programs; and (5) the decision to use "overhead" derived from federal contracts primarily for research projects and institutional growth rather than for attracting low-income students.

Alexander W. Astin, in a very interesting study of "The Myth of Equal Access" [Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol XI, no. 3, Sept. 1975, p. 24], points out that "Hierarchies within the public systems [of higher education] were developed as part of a conscious plan." Furthermore, "...the resources available in any public institution are closely correlated with its position in this heirarchy." Astin points out that in 1971-72, $5,408 was expended per student in the "most selective" public universities as compared with $1,534 per student in the "least selective" four-year colleges and $1,533 in junior colleges.

One of the more significant aspects of this class-system in higher education is that:

> "Minority enrollments among freshmen entering two-year and non-selective four-year public colleges in 1973 were 12 per cent and 19 per cent, respectively, compared with only 5 per cent in the most selective... Median family income levels ranged from $17,843 in the most selective universities to $12,195 in the two-year colleges. These figures strongly support the notion that "them that has, gets."

As a result of the so-called "Master Plan" for higher education in California, the University of California's primary pool of potential admittees is to be found within the upper 12 1/2% of any high school graduating class. But I stress "within," because, in fact, the University may (and reportedly does) restrict admissions still further by favoring "elite" high schools, screening students by means of tests, etcetera.

In any case, the University's admission and other policies clearly link it with the wealthier, lighter-skinned people of California. The University of California also came to be inter-locked with the white elite sector of the population because it chose over the years (with greater acceleration more recently) to emphasize the training of persons for occupations of higher prestige, or high income, or both, or ones which directly serve the corporate power-structure at an advanced level (e.g., doctors, lawyers, dentists, engineers, scientists, college professors, business managers, etcetera). Increasingly, the occupations directly related to the masses (public school teaching, social work etcetera) are being eliminated or reduced in scope. In similar fashion, the University has increasingly emphasized graduate training, an area very definitely related to "interfacing" with high levels of business, government, and, of course, other universities and private research-for-profit organizations.

The influence of World War II and the "G.I. Bill," accompanied by internal changes in minority communities, led to the gradual entrance of non-white students into the University of California. Then the riots of the mid-1960's and the student unrest which soon followed finally opened the doors of the institution to larger numbers

of blacks, Chicanos, and Indians. This change was, no doubt, largely due to new federally-financed student aid programs coupled with a fear of violence.

As late as 1967-1969, however, most campuses were almost wholly white in so far as the faculty was concerned and administrators, clerical staff, maintenance crews, etcetera, also tended to include only a "token" minority person here and there. The new minority students, however, began to organize, stage strikes, issue demands, and so on, with the result that non-white faculty and administrators began to be hired, especially in minority-oriented offices and in so-called "ethnic studies" programs.

In brief, the changes which have occurred in the University since, say, 1945 and especially since 1965 have apparently not been due to the University's own efforts but rather to external forces, i.e., federal subsidies (G.I. Bill, Economic Opportunity Grants, etc), riots and student unrest, and, in general, militancy on the part of non-whites. More recently, federal "affirmative action" requirements have greatly "encouraged" the University to integrate its work force, albeit with little impact at the faculty level on many campuses.

The federal government may well be satisfied when minority student enrollments and numbers of minority employees range up towards state or regional averages. On the other hand, the mere integration of "bodies" will not alter racist, mono-cultural, and segregationist tendencies within higher education.

Ethnicity and Academic Life

We might look at the struggle for racial justice in higher education from the following perspective: the first battle, from the 1940's to the 1960's, was to get non-white students in; the second battle, from the 1960's to the present, was to get more low-income and non-white students in and to begin the integration of the faculty, administration, etcetera; the third battle, from the late 1960's into the future, is to continue the above but also to alter the mission, curricula, and values of the university so as to make it a culturally plural, non-racist institution.

None of these battles has really been concluded as of yet. In fact, since 1973 or 1974 the "Steady State" (no growth) policy of the U.C. Regents, economic slowdowns in other states, and a "backlash" on the part of white males has halted the momentum of even "body-integration."

The "no growth" policy of the University of California is blamed upon legislative/gubernatorial attacks on the budget, a declining college-age population, disenchantment with the value of a college degree, and inflationary or unstable tendencies in the economy. On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that the University of California has consciously sought to restrict the kinds of students it can admit and also discourages adult or other part-time students. It is worth noting that the university's emphasis upon graduate programs of a highly-specialized nature has caused most departments to take little interest in teaching per se. This, in turn, helps to discourage the recruitment of adult part-time students who are, usually, not likely to seek doctoral degrees.

The University has also discouraged part-time students by excessive fees, and increasing tuition for full-time students likewise stands as a bar to many persons who do not qualify for financial assistance. I would suggest that non-whites and people (in general) of mature years could more than make up for a leveling off of the so-called normal college-age population, at least for some years to come.

In any case, "steady state" has eliminated most new faculty positions, just at the time when non-whites were beginning to be employed. University President David Saxon has stated that, because of budgetary restraints, there may be "rigorous and selective pruning and even phasing out of the less essential, of the less than excellent." [The Daily Democrat, Oct. 14, 1975, p. 6]. Thus the "Steady State" also poses a threat for entire programs, but what kind? Minority "ethnic studies," for example?

It is no secret that many minority programs have experienced problems in terms of enrollment figures per course, retention or hiring of faculty, promotion of faculty, and development of well-conceptualized programs. But many of these problems, at heart, stem from such barriers as: (1) low minority admissions (for reasons discussed elsewhere), (2) castrating minority faculty by making inordinate demands in terms of "university service," by placing them in prejudiced departments, or by denying them research assistance (as a lecturer, for example), and (3) expecting publishing in "prestige" journals or of books when both journals and publishing houses are often culturally-biased or are white market-oriented.

We must be very careful, when "pruning" takes place, that programs are cut or eliminated only after having had a fair trial, with support equivalent to other, more established fields.

Let us ponder this phenomena for a moment: during the 1950's and 1960's the University of California grew at an impressive rate. The Davis campus, for example, hired hundreds of new faculty (and this was duplicated at San Diego, Irvine, Santa Cruz and elsewhere). On the other hand this growth took place under segregated conditions, that is, only whites and a few overseas Asians were employed, with rare exception. The College of Letters and Science at Davis grew from virtually nothing to a large faculty during this period, but at the end of 1968 the College possessed only one Black, no Indians, no Chicanos, no Filipinos, and virtually no other native-born non-whites at any full-time professorial-level rank.

In short, if the 1950's and 1960's had been utilized to hire Black graduates from Howard, Fisk, etcetera, and to bring in other non-whites, the University of Calfornia could have integrated its staff at least partially. But by the post-1968 period, when the hiring of minorities became necessary (because of student pressure) the University's growth began to falter, and then halt! Thus "slow growth" and the "steady state" can now be used as excuses for retaining a segregated faculty for another decade or two!

Perhaps it is foolish to speak of a "backlash" against integration when, in fact, integration has hardly begun on many campuses. I feel that what has happened, at least as regards the conservative faculty, is that the fear of 1968-1969, which led to a few changes, has now been overcome by a desire to restore the status quo.

Generally speaking, the Free Speech Movement, the anti-Vietnam movement, the minority liberation coalitions, and related efforts were all failures in relation to higher education in that the reforms they achieved were all peripheral and failed utterly to break the strangle hold over promotions, hiring, curricula, educational policy, and admissions possessed by the entrenched, conservative white faculty (and allied administrators). Thus it has been relatively easy for this latter group to whittle away, one by one, at reforms, deny tenure to minority faculty, delay or deny approval of new curricula, tighten up on special admissions, toughen entrance requirements, and intimidate younger faculty with the threat of the denial of promotion or tenure.

The "steady state" has played into the hands of the conservative group controlling faculty governance. In a situation of growth, generally, it is possible for a younger professor to hope to gain promotion on his own merits. In a no-growth situation, however, (and especially when accompanied by a tight national job market) merit is no guarantee of promotion. One has to either have "merit-plus" or cultivate a proper stance of loyalty and the "right" political connections in order to gain tenure. "Merit-plus" poses many dangers: first, too rapid publication can be criticized by jealous superiors and can seriously warp a person's total development as a teacher and thinker. It can also effectively remove a minority professor from any community service or work with students, since the extra publications required demand almost total preoccupation with careerism.

Academic departments have long been known for their personalistic politics and petty subjectivism. In a no-growth situation a younger professor is at the mercy of the rival cliques in the department and must choose to join a strong one in order to survive, or if one clique controls the department he must cater to it. This situation is greatly complicated for non-whites in fields (such as the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Arts) where racism and ethnic chauvinism are often characteristic of the members of the ruling cliques. It has been said that a minority scholar can only secure

tenure if he gets it upon entrance (the wisest move) or acts like a white man, sharing (or never openly challenging) the culture-bound assumptions of his white overseers (in most departments which I have observed assistant professors are not colleagues of the tenured faculty, and the smart assistant soon learns who the "boss-men" are).

The problem of promotion in relation to "scholarship" will be discussed later. At this point, it is sufficient to note that the slow-down in growth has imposed severe handicaps upon non-white faculty who are largely of non-tenured rank.

One of the problems faced by faculty and prospective faculty from non-European cultures consists in the fact that many academic areas of study ("disciplines") are not the end-result of a logical culturally-neutral evolutionary process. Some are clearly creations arising form peculiarly European or Euro-North American ideas.

By way of example, one can cite the Native American "science of harmony and balance" ("health science") which embraces areas of psychology, physical medicine, religion, philosophy, and anthropology (not to mention music, art and other fields). Native scientists would not attempt to separate the "mind" from the "body" or the "individual" from his culture, community and total environment. The European division between physical medicine and psychology/ psychiatric medicine might well be rooted in a doctrine of mind-body dualism, a concept foreign to Native American philosophy.

Similarly, the white division between psychology and cultural anthropology is difficult to understand. How can one consider a person's "psyche" apart from his culture and especially apart from those of his kinfolk, community and nation? Conversely, how can one conceive of "culture" apart from the processes of the mind, feelings, dreams, etcetera?

For a variety of reasons, however, the literatures and methods of psychology and anthropology seem quite distinct and the data collected in the two "disciplines" is seldom integrated. Perhaps, in fact, it is largely not even integratable which if that is the case, would argue that the existence of the two "disciplines" as separate, walled-off units, has actually harmed the development of knowledge in the broad area of understanding human behavior (at least).

In any event, many non-Europeans might find it difficult to remain true to the perspectives of their own historical intellectual systems while submitting to the methodological and subject-matter narrowness (or arbitrariness) of some established departments. (There is, of course, no question but what European and Euro-North American methods of slicing up human knowledge have been spread to many non-European portions of the globe but it must also be admitted, I think, that the major force behind that diffusion has been European colonialism and European control of universities in non-white countries.)

In my years of participation in higher education I have perceived a tendency for the established "disciplines" to exhibit an almost ethnic or sectarian character. That is, I have often heard comments and observed behavior strongly suggestive of the most ardent Brooklyn Dodger fans in the "old days" of baseball or of followers of some fundamentalist religious sect. One is supposed to be "loyal" to a discipline, use its methodology exclusively (or predominantly, especially if of junior rank), publish in its associated journals, belong to its associations, use its specialized jargon, and cultivate social ties with fellow-disciplinarians. Of course there are many exceptions but I still believe this is a tendency which is real and one which poses a difficulty for many non-whites.

I have a hunch, and at this stage it is only that, that the people who generally develop their "discipline" as a pseudo-tribe are, in fact, people who lack a meaningful ethnic community. Conversely, people who have an ethnic community with all of the associated kinship and social relations, will tend not to need to create a feeling of shared community primarily within their field of study.

In any event, how can a Native scholar concerned with the past of his people, let us say, become a "good" historian or a "good" anthropologist when it is impossible to adequately reconstruct the history of a Native people without using the data and methods of both history and anthropology, along with lesser inputs form geography, historical botany, literature, etcetera? Certainly, it is possible for some persons to be "interdisciplinary" (especially after achieving tenure) but how does one receive

doctoral training specifically oriented towards unified Native Studies? And how does one get one's first job in a university if the anthropologists define one's work as historical and the historians call it anthropology?

What I am suggesting, in short, is that the way "knowledge" is divided up in many colleges is perhaps inherently biased, in an ethno-cultural sense, and that the development of "fields" as quasi-messianic "fraternities" presents a handicap to some non-white thinkers.

The present "steady state" of the University of California also creates other problems for non-whites in that the rapid, segregated growth of the University in the 1950's and 1960's not only led to greater numbers of white faculty but also to the elephantine expansion of peculiarly white, European areas of subject-matter interest.

Here we must pause to consider, briefly, the concept of "ethnic studies." To the white ruling-class the culture, history, language, etcetera, of ethnic groups is not "ethnic" if it is part of their own European cultural-historical tradition. It is also not "ethnic" when a white Anglo-Saxon teaches about China or Brazil. But when a Chicano teaches about the Chicano heritage, or when a white teaches a course about black history as a part of a black-developed curriculum, that becomes "ethnic."

The word "ethnic" is, of course, a weapon used against minority groups. The white Anglo-Saxon does not want to be an "ethnic" because this is "his country" and "how can one be an ethnic in one's own country?" But, of course, this is a racist absurdity! Every ethnic group is, by definition, "ethnic" and, in any case, European-Americans merely by having a numerical majority have not erased the fact of their own relatively recent migration to this land.

In any case, "ethnic studies" relating to German, French, Spanish, British (really Anglo-Saxon), Anglo-American, Greek, Italian, and pan-European history, culture, language, art, philosophy, music, literature, etcetera, experienced a phenomenal growth in the University of California. During the 1950's and 1960's monies available for growth were not divided up so as to develop new programs relating to blacks, Chicanos, Native Americans, Asian-Americans, Celts, Poles, Portuguese, Basques, Armenians, etcetera. No, the existing German, French, Spanish, Anglo-American, etcetera, departments simply gobbled up all of the funds, hired new faculty, offered new courses, and recruited students in a completely irrational (but profitable) distortion of the world's collective heritage.

By 1968-1969, when growth began to slow, the University of California was "in possession" of a terribly skewed curricula weighted markedly in favor of European/European-American studies (and even within that framework, distorted in favor of a few European societies and languages).

Now, in the 1970's, the professors of German culture, Anglo-Saxon literature, European philosophy, etcetera, stand as an obstacle to change (although they are not always self-consciously so). First, they control the power-structure of colleges of letters and science or at least share power with natural/physical scientists (who are, generally, remarkably European in their outlook). Second, they control most promotions in the letters and arts area. Third, they are frightened of losing their power and faculty-positions by declining enrollment, loss of budgetary support, and changes in options open to students.

This Europeanist power-structure, which the University consciously created, is the foremost obstacle to new admissions policies, educational reforms, and minority studies programs. Special admission students tend to be non-white and they tend to enroll in non-Europeanist courses (not only because they take Black Studies, etc., courses but also because they seem to identify racist professors and quietly boycott their courses). Therefore, it is necessary to tighten up on admissions to keep the same type of white, conformist, upper-class student as in the past.

Educational reform is dangerous because it made such things possible as independent study, inter-disciplinary majors, ad hoc courses taught only once, "work-learn" internship-study, etcetera. All of these options tend to compete for enrollment with established courses. They also help to make students more independent and self-directing, which

conservative faculty applaud in theory but abhor in practice. (As is to be seen in the shockingly detailed requirements imposed upon students by some colleges and departments.)

Minority studies programs and other new curricula directly threaten the European ethnic studies departments by competing for students, faculty slots, and University budgets. They must, therefore, be destroyed or at least crippled. On the Davis campus, Black Studies and Chicano Studies were successfully crippled, in my opinion, by being controlled directly by the Europeanist College of Letters and Science (without having even their own departments). Native American and Asian-American studies escaped the same fate by affiliating with the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, with each having a degree of autonomy. On the other hand, their growth has been hurt by several factors, including rules making it difficult for Letters and Science majors to enroll for courses in other colleges and the overwhelmingly white character of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.

The battle of European ethnics on the faculty against minority ethnics is, in part, merely the battle of an entrenched "in" group to preserve its privileged position against newcomers. But it is also more than that, because (1) it is a logical result of the history of the University, (2) it coalesces nicely with the racial, cultural bias of the University, and (3) it is part of the system of racism entrenched in the United States.

Many European-derived faculty, sad to state, are little if any different from white factory-workers, firemen, school teachers, policemen, and other occupation groups in the degree to which their attitudes have been affected by racism. Although many white academics pretended to be "liberals" when the lower-classes were facing integration, they themselves appear to be far more resistant to desegregation (both because they earlier failed to set any kind of an example and, now, because they resist even in the face of successful integration at other levels of employment).

White academics, of course, try to hide their racism behind a mask of so-called "objectivity." They will say, for instance, that "expertise" (the doctorate) is requisite for University employment and they will state that "if only" a black would show up with "good credentials" they would be glad to hire him (now, however, its "superior credentials" in the mood of the "backlash"). Unfortunately, the color of their secretaries, clerk-typists, associates, lecturers, etcetera, often puts the lie to their protestations. On the Davis campus, for example, office after office has only white employees or mostly white staff in spite of being located in a county with a 20% minority population and adjacent to a large city with at least a one-third non-white population.

More significantly, however, the demand for "expertise" and "superior credentials" is often a culturally-determined weapon used in a purely subjective way. More on that later, in connection with the subject of racism and scholarship.

The militant intransigence of the conservative white faculty is illustrated also by a disguised attack on admitting more low-income and non-white students. The attack, sprung by a 1975 faculty conference open only to invited participants, takes the form of extreme criticism of the competence of existing University undergraduates especially in relation to English-language written expression. The gist of the proposal put forth by the faculty present was to require a kind of a rite of passage, in the form of competency-testing exams, before a student could move from sophomore to junior standing. This illustrates, of course, one of the passions of the current faculty which is to inflict on students more and more rules, requirements, examinations, and bureaucratic red-tape.

As an aside, it is worth noting that college professors and not administrators are responsible for most of the requirements found in catalogues. This illustrates the bureaucratic-anthoritarian values which are far more prevalent than liberal, democratic values among the faculty in power.

In any event, the attack upon the University's students was absurd. The typical incoming freshman, I am told, currently has an "A" or "A-" grade-point average from high school. Criticizing these elite, middle-class students is a clever way to tell the vice-chancellors and people in charge of admissions to tighten up on entrance requirements, thus adversely affecting minorities.

It may be that incoming college students today are less proficient in written English than were students in years past. I cannot comment on that. On the other hand, I would suggest that the failure of a substantial portion of the English-speaking population (from 20 to 40%) to acquire adequate mastery over English-language literacy is in great measure due to the teachers of English (and especially to the "enforcers" of so-called "correct" spelling and "rules" of grammar) who have perpetuated archaic, non-phonetic forms of spelling and an inconsistent system of grammar. It seems likely that without teachers of spelling and grammarians we ought to have changed "light" to "lite" (or "lait") by now and perhaps we might also have regularized some of our verb conjugations (I walk, I walked; I run, I runned, I speak, I speaked etcetera).

The kind of English which university professors use (and expect their students to use) is neither better nor worse than any other dialect of English. However, it is the idiom of the upper-classes and of the north-central parts of the country. People from certain minorities, other social classes and certain regions must become bi-dialectical in order to use "standard" English, an added burden not imposed upon pupils of upper-class origin.

Many Indians with eloquent speaking ability could never write an essay acceptable to the average professor. Similarly, many Native students can express themselves well orally but have great difficulty in written English. Part of the problem, I believe, stems from having been castrated by teachers who placed too much stress on the "correctness" of their spelling or grammar and not enough stress on how one gets ideas across in whatever dialect one speaks.

It seems to me, then, that the minority or low-income student presents colleges with a challenge which is also an opportunity of great significance: a chance to reform the English language and also to develop ways to encourage people to use whatever dialect they have available in order to achieve full and satisfying written expression. Then, perhaps, they can become bi-dialectical with ease, or change their dialect if they wish.

I would like to refer at this point again to Professor Astin's article. Astin, a professor of higher education at the University of California, Los Angeles, and president of the Higher Education Research Institute, compellingly argues that "selective admission" is maintained by colleges "probably...less for educational reasons than for reasons of competition and status." I would agree, but would add that the "status-seeking" is rooted in the perversion of human values flowing from centuries of European class oppression and imperialism.

Astin, also convincingly, shatters the myths used to support "selectivity." For example,

> The traditional view is that academic standards are determined primarily by the abilities of the students admitted....Ironically [however], the only time academic standards are truly determined by admission standards is when the college has no impact on performance: what comes out is simply what goes in. [Italics added]. If one accepts the idea that colleges exist to educate, then selective admissions based on test scores and prior grades make little sense....The mission of the college is not simply to maximize its output of distinguished alumni by enrolling as many talented students as possible....

Finally, Professor Astin makes the telling comment:

> Why should substantially more resources be invested in educating high-performing as opposed to average-or-low-performing students? And, as an indirect consequence of selective admissions, why should substantially less be invested in educating poor and minority students? [Astin, "The Myth of Equal Access," Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. XI, no. 3, Sept. 1975, p. 24].

Significantly the Univerity has found that junior-college transfer students, after spending two years in supposedly inferior colleges with open admissions policies, do just about the same as students who spent their first two years at the University (and, therefore, had good grades in high school). What does this mean? That only the "best" of the junior college products come on to the University? Or that the theory of "selective admissions" is unsupported by the University's own evidence?

I have taught in a junior college, a four-year state college, a small state university and at the University of California, among other places. I can say honestly that I have had good students at all of those institutions, in about equal proportions, but that the most exciting students have been at the schools where I had more people of working-class or minority-origin, or who were mature adults working their way through college. On the Davis campus of the University I have had a disappointingly large number of mediocre, conformist, unimaginative students who will, I am sure, make adequate bank tellers, loan officers, or technicians. Some of these are graduate students who have, or will, obtain advanced degrees.

I believe that students whose originality, creativeness, and individuality has been stunted or destroyed by years of learning how to memorize for tests and otherwise obtain top grades can indeed score very well on entrance exams. They can also get "A's" in the University and go on to pass their Ph.D. exams. Tragically, however, many such students are walking computers who can only regurgitate what they have been programmed with. They will produce technically acceptable but intellectually uninspiring dissertations and, after mastering an appropriate jargon, will write articles for journals whose editors place correctness of form above all other considerations.

Now a new move is underway to require that University of California applicants be judged on a combination of their high school grade-point average, their SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) verbal score, and their SAT math score. Perhaps this is a disguised attack upon minority admissions, since quite clearly non-European people will have a disadvantage in scoring well on examinations designed to measure learning within the context of European-American culture.

William W. Turnbull, president of Educational Testing Service, has recently written:

> The evidence about college entrance tests as predictors is no longer a subject of legitimate dispute....By and large, the higher the test scores, the more successful the students are in college....The medium in which the questions are presented and in which the solutions are required is that of the majority culture. Since college and university work is embedded in the same culture, the test scores represent quite well the degree to which the students is prepared....
>
> Black and brown people score lower, on the average, than do whites....If school and college work is culture-bound and if tests are devised mainly to predict success in such work, then it follows that culture-bound tests will do the best job of prediction....
>
> The first thing to be said as clearly and forcefully as possible is that test scores should never be used alone in selection....(from Ronald J. Samuda, Psychological Testing of American Minorities: Issues and Consequences, 1975, pp. vii-xi).

Isn't it somewhat ironic (and significant) that a group of professors and administrators should propose using culture-bound test results as two-thirds of an applicant's admission score, with the other one-third derived from equally culture-bound high school grades? This would seem to confirm that the same professors have no intention of altering the mono-cultural nature of the University.

The problem of admissions is, of course, a serious one. At the present time many Sioux students would not score well on a test given in the Sioux language with questions drawn from Sioux culture and history. Why? Because many have never had a chance to learn their own language in a written form and since the curricula they have been exposed to has been a one-sided white one (which they may have rejected without having much to put in its place).

Should such Sioux students (and similar Chicano, Boricua, and other non-European persons) be barred from access to universities because they never had a chance to receive a relevant education? Can a university turn its back on a whole class of citizens with the hope that the high schools, in twenty years, will do a better job for minorities? Can a university maintain a mono-cultural, racist curricula while demanding that the public schools make the effort to become culturally-pluralistic?

Universities, of all places, should have the expertise and resources to admit and help such students. If they do not, then they should completely abandon teaching in

such areas as psychology, child development, education, composition, literature, etcetera, and confess that they are not equipped to deal with the vast majority of our youth or with those subjects directly relating to the solution of those very youth's problems.

Isn't it interesting that the elite universities seek to shunt such students over to the junior colleges (or low-prestige four-year schools) whose faculties face heavy teaching and advising loads (and often large class sizes) and, supposedly, lack the expertise to solve the student's problems (since, after all, junior college teachers are not supposed to be experts in learning disorders, cognitive development theories, etcetera).

But, of course, the elite universities are completely hypocritical, seeking more money for themselves to work with fewer students and easier ones at that, students who have, in effect, already mastered the basic skills of survival in white academia. The truth may well be that many universities simply do not want too many low-income, minority students because it would require them to take another look at their curricula, their priorities, and their neglect of basic undergraduate teaching.

Or could it be that many professors would rather consult with federal agencies and public school districts, or do research for the U.S. Office of Education, than to actually implement in their own lives the theories which they tell others to carry out?

In the University of California the current attack on student competence is closely related to a concern with the rise in the grade-point average of all students at the University. The same faculty who argue the incompetence of students are alarmed that these same students are getting better grades than did previous generations of students. Both of these issues relate to the desire of conservative Europeanist professors to force on to students an authoritarian, fiercely competitive, and hierarchical environment which is not a necessary part of learning per se, but is rather a part of an upper-class European authoritarian caste-oriented cultural system. In short, it is part of the cultural bias we have been alluding to.

In any event, this authoritarian tradition constitutes both a direct attack upon the values of many non-white students (whose cultures often do not favor authoritarianism) and also an attack upon the new, innovative courses developed since 1965. These new courses and programs, it is alleged, give out too many high grades. (Of course, the conservative professors cannot face the possibility that students do better work in a free or a culturally-relevant setting).

Many conservative faculty continue to use the "curve" as a weapon against students. They restrict the number of top grades in such a manner as to force students to either viciously compete with each other, cheat, or drop-out of the "rat-race" by accepting a "C" or a "D." This method of teaching is not only culturally determined but is also specifically designed to socialize a person in a particular direction. Do professors have a right to set up particular systems of socialization or advocate (by their methods) one culture over another? If they do, at least we must admit that in colleges supported by all tax payers dissenting cultures have a right to practice their methods at public expense also.

White children, especially from middle-class, rigid traditions, have often been socialized at an early age to "obey orders" without asking why (as when they have to eat dinner at a fixed hour whether they are hungry or not, using certain established "rules of etiquette" which are quite arbitrary, eating everything on their plate, etcetera). Many non-white children, especially if of Native ancestry, have been socialized in a way which tends to respect their choices as human beings.

The values operationalized by a society's institutions are significant in relation to processes of socialization as well as being reflections of socialization. Thus authoritarian schools would seem to help to create authoritarian persons and at the same time to reflect already established authoritarian values. In other words, a hierarchical university with innumerable restrictions placed upon the learning process is no mere "relic" or fluke of custom. <u>It is an actively partisan social institution and its operational values (as opposed to its professed values) tell us what kind of a society it is reflecting and what kind it is seeking to create</u>.

Many students "fail" or "drop-out" because they cannot accept the culture of the faculty rather than because of any lack of motivation or potential. Should this be possible? Why should a single aspect of the European heritage, that authoritarian, elitist tradition of the German schoolmen, become entrenched as the ruling system in universities on American soil?

Part Two:

Racism, Scholarship, and Tenure

21

Research, Scholarship and Ethnic Bias

The area of scholarship, so-called, is also closely related to the empowerment of the same Europeanist tradition and its nature is crucial to any analysis of the University of California since "research" and "creative work serve as the basis for its reward system (tenure and promotion).

In 1974 Regent's lobbyist Jay Micheal told a group of students that the University of California "is a research oriented institution where the search for new knowledge comes first and teaching second" (paraphrased by the reporter). "The U.C. is modeled after Harvard and Harvard is modeled after Oxford." The five most important priorities of the University, as summarized by Michael, are: "First is research. Second is the transmittal of knowledge. Third is to serve as a repository for the knowledge of mankind. Fourth is to criticize conventional wisdom and fifth is to utilize accumulated knowledge for the betterment of the human condition." [Jim York, California Aggie, October 31, 1974, p. 1].

Before going into an analysis of research, promotion and cultural bias it is best to clarify some terms. Academicians have a strong tendency to use "in-house" jargon in order to (I believe) impress the masses and sometimes provide the illusion of expertise, but more on that later.

"Scholarship" is a widely-used term and many of us have been put on trial in regards to whether we have "it" or not. What is its meaning? A scholar is one who attends a school, or is connected with a school. It formerly was used for pupils or students (in the English language) and still is in Spanish. "Scholarship" is, therefore, the art or ability of being a school-person. It has nothing to do with publishing per se, or with experimental research. It probably can be interpreted as referring primarily to studying and learning, activities which are presumably to be as closely associated with students of all ages, public school teachers, apprentices of traditional Indian teachers, etc., as much as with college professors.

"Scholarship" is used by university professors and administrators in a very different manner, but we do not need to try to precisely define its meaning because it is really used as a device for creating "awe" and not to convey specific content. It is one of many vague, ambiguous words used by those in power to create smoke screens around what it is they are doing and to invoke respect even though that which is to be respected is not made clear.

"Research" is a simple word made complex in a manner similar to the above. "Research" means "again searching" or, we could say, "looking again." The word "investigation" essentially means "to look" or "to look into," (to "trace out") so it adds no profundity. Whether we say "scientific research" or "scientific investigation" we are simply saying "looking again to see or understand" or "looking to see or understand" (since all "science" means is "seeing" or, perhaps, understanding. Some would add "organized" or "systematic" but all the latter words mean is, in essence, "orderly" or "related parts").

In truth, adding the word "science" to "research" or "investigation" adds nothing new, since one "looks" to "see" anyway. (Some would say that a "science" is an "organized body of knowledge" but that definition can be applied to any orderly grouping of data or "seeing.")

"Organized research" is another oft-used concept but all it means is "orderly looking again" or "ordered looking again;" or, we could say, "looking again according to a plan."

One of the primary missions of the University, according to President David S. Saxon and others, is to carry out "basic research." President Saxon states: "the University is the only public institution in California charged with looking into the fundamentals of our universe, doing basic research." [California Aggie, Oct. 7, 1975, p. 1.]

Clearly, the term "basic searching-again" is an extremely ambiguous concept. "Basic" and "fundamental" both refer to "getting to the base, foundation, or bottom of something." So we can say that "basic research" is "again-searching for the bottom," that is, to peel off layers of superfluity, apparent facts, and first-impressions or hunches to get at the "real" problem and its solution. But what is "basic" to understanding an onion? The peeling-off until we come to a "core?" The study of various layers? Or must we understand the entire onion?

The world, and the phenomena in it, is much like an onion. No one part is really the "core" or the "real." All parts are there to be studied and understood. What one chooses to regard as being especially worthy of study is often the result of one's culture, value-system, interest, and/or response to the availability of funds, etcetera. Indians, for example, generally regard the study of "outer space" as little more than a welfare program for white scientists, technicians and military personnel (with damaging economic and military side-effects). To them it is certainly not "basic." Why? In part, because the space science field is European materialist in its assumptions and because the nature of the Universe can best be understood by inner-exploring and, in part, because there are other, much more basic, questions to be dealt with (such as "how should one live in this life").

Supposedly, "basic research" is different and intellectually superior to "applied research." On the other hand, this is a pseudo-proposition because there are many occasions where one has to actually apply a given theory, model, strategy, or principle in order to study it, learn of its actual behavior, test it, or even to fully conceptualize it in the first place. Thus one can have a theory about how to write a great novel in a particular subject-area (let us say) but until one has actually written such a novel, the theory is not "basic" it is just an unsupported hunch.

I think the real question is: does this bit of "again-searching" help us to better understand the world, or a part of it? Thus the University's development of a mechanized lettuce-picker probably does not (in and of itself) help our understanding since it is an elaboration, presumably, on other machines. But the development of a Native American-based curriculum unit for the schools may very well advance our understanding, partly because it has never been done before and partly because its development, which will probably include testing and community reaction, helps to build theory in the areas of Native education and educational development.

Even the lettuce-picker, on the other hand, could have been developed as a part of a grower-farm worker community-based effort with theory-building implications. That it was not is not the fault of "applied research" as such but rather rests with the University's poorly-disguised alliance with corporate agriculture. It is, in short, the University's damaging interlock with the wealthy classes (and government) which is usually to blame for the distortion of "applied research." (I will refer to this subject again).

Another fundamental problem relating to the supposed dichotomy between "basic" and "applied" again-searching, especially as it relates to the humanities and social sciences, is well expressed by Juan Matus; a Yaqui teacher:

> That's the flaw with words....They always force us to feel enlightened, but when we turn around to face the world they always fail us and we end up facing the world as we always have, without enlightenment. For this reason, a sorcerer seeks to act rather than to talk and to this effect he gets a new description of the world - a new description where talking is not that important, and where new acts have new reflections. [Carlos Castaneda, Tales of Power, N. Y., 1974, p. 32].

Or again, he tells us:

> I told you once that our lot as men is to learn, for good or bad...You should know by now that a man of knowledge lives by acting, not by thinking about acting, nor by thinking about what he will think when he has finished acting....[Carlos Castaneda, A Separate Reality, N.Y., 1972, p. 85].

These quotes do not refer primarily to "acting" in the sense of, let us say, roller-skating or any other specific physical endeavour. Rather, "acting" refers to a person's total life being a consistent, integrated spiral of thought-action-thought.

One of the problems with many academics is that, in truth, their knowledge of their subjects is entirely verbal or, shall we say, "academic." Their personal lives may not even reflect the opinions expressed in lectures (as when, for example, they verbally pose as a sharp critic of injustice but never, in fact, do anything to resist injustice outside of their classroom). More significantly, they may never be able to understand other "descriptions of the world" because they suppose that one can comprehend different cultures or groups by observation or documentary research alone.

For example, observing Indians is one thing. "Acting" as an Indian, however, is quite another. It is, for instance, the difference between seeing an Indian standing on a street corner from the window of your Land Cruiser or having to share your last five dollars (which you need for food) with someone else who has no money at all; or reading about prejudice as opposed to having White people try to force you out of an apartment because you play Indian music and have only mattresses to sleep on.

I mention these things not to propose that professors be forced to go out and work as one of those they study (although that might not be a bad kind of a sabbatical) but rather to emphasize that some kinds of knowledge cannot be acquired verbally or by observation. Expecially when we approach the realm of the development of "wisdom" (of which more later) do we see, I think, the necessity for a more than observational or verbal kind of knowledge.

"Applied" research can, in some cases, be viewed as a way of actually "acting" upon theories or of really knowing what one is talking about. (Can one imagine a teacher of veterinary medicine writing about the treatment of a fracture in the leg of a bull if he had never, in fact, tried to apply a cast to a real bull?).

In any event, it is hard to imagine "basic research" in the social sciences, arts, and humanities having taken place <u>at all</u> when Native American, Chicano, black, and other non-European perspectives and data have so frequently been excluded.

And again, when we try to ask "what again-seeking is truly fundamental?" We must, it seems to me, come back to "how does one live in this life?" Isn't it strange, however, how few sections in a mammoth university are at all concerned with this and interlocking questions? Native American thinking and "research" is much concerned with this area. For example, Juan Matus, the Yaqui man of knowledge, sets up a situation which results in his apprentice unintentionally killing a rabbit. Juan then states that the rabbit's death was a gift for the apprentice, just as the latter's death will be a gift for someone else.

The concept of our deaths as gifts for the earth, for bugs, for microbes, etcetera, is rather profound. Indians also tell us that we should discover our real self-identity as a first step in learning. One aspect of this is to realize that we can lose our hands, legs, arms, eyes, ears, nose, and many other parts of "our body" and still live, but if we lose the air, water, earth, sun, plants, or animals we must die, instantly or at least in short order. Thus the air is more a part of us, more essential to our being alive, than is part of what we are trained to call our "selves."

In relation to "life" how is "basic research" conducted? Do college professors know the most about life because of having a doctorate, or because they have read 535 novels, or because they have interviewed 47 farm workers, or because they have read philosophy from Aristotle to Zarathustra? Let's not deceive ourselves, some of the most "basic research" is being conducted by people whose only doctorate, as they say, comes from the "School of Hard-knocks," or from the many educational programs offered to us by the earth, plants, animals, and other living things. (But, of course, many of these nitty-gritty again-searchers do not publish. Some can't even write! How could they teach in an institution where writing is equivalent to intelligence?)

In any case, "research" and other "magic" words used by the University to describe the fundamental work of its faculty are also descriptive of quite commonplace kinds of activity. For instance, let us suppose that a plumber is faced with a difficult problem to solve. Of course, an experienced plumber will possess a detailed knowledge of all of the tools and parts available to his trade. He will, in short, possess "an organized body of knowledge" and a methodology. But in the crawl space under any house many options are available, some providing an aesthetically-pleasing or functional directness with a minimum of expensive "unions," others providing a more cumbersome arrangement. "Careful looking" and "looking again" must take place to map out which pipes go where

and to design replacement systems which one can actually tighten in the scant space under a house. The process of "insight" must also be involved, as there is a definite need for "seeing" what options are best and especially for anticipating problems and places where future connections might have to be made.

A good plumbing job, then, requires "organized research" and also possesses a creative aspect. The result is, in truth, something of a "work of art."

Similar use of "searching again" occurs in relation to many non-university activities ranging from an Indian woman "systematically" planning how she is going to feed her family from crops and wild foods for the year to a man designing and building his own house without blueprints. Of course, Native People have had to carry out a lot of "basic research" to discover the natures of thousands of plants from Toloatzin (Jimson Weed) to the Jojoba bean and to maximize the potential of many plants (such as the tomato, potato, and maize).

The University, of course, does not concern itself with "again-searching" in any but a few chosen areas and, in addition, the "again-searching" is not enough, in and of itself. Research or creative acts (which will be discussed below) must produce "new knowledge" or show "new insights" and make a "contribution" to be considered worthy in the academic world, at least in theory.

Ethnicity, Products, and Promotion

The Handbook for Faculty Members (1968) of the University of California states that promotions are to be based upon merit and that promotions to tenured rank:

> should be based on consideration of comparable work in a man's own field or in closely related fields. The Department and the review committee should consider how the candidate stands in relation to other people in his field outside the University who might be considered alternative candidates for the position [p. 66].

The candidate's record is to be considered in relation to teaching, "research or other creative work", professional activities, and university and public service.

> However, superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions....[italicized in the handbook, p. 67].

The Handbook goes on to state that:

> Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the candidate's published research or recognized artistic production in original architectural or engineering designs, or the like....There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance....Account should be taken of the type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate's field. [p. 68]

The Handbook then goes on to outline the relative value to be accorded to various kinds of products. "Appraisals of publications or other works in the scholarly and critical literature provide important testimony." On the other hand, "textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar publications normally considered evidence of teaching ability or public service" may be judged as "creative work" but "only if they present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research."

In fields such as art, music, et cetera, "distinguished creation" is to be considered. The candidate's merit is to be defined in relation to such criteria as "originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression." "Distinguished performance" is adequate evidence in music, drama, and dance.

I cannot quarrel with much in the above policy. By and large it is flexible enough to meet the needs of non-European faculty. Problems do arise, however, with the interpretation of the above language by faculty committees. For minority professors, for instance, a problem may arise in the definition of one's "field." Perhaps "Black Studies" is the professor's field (from his perspective) but his doctoral training was in history. He may, therefore, be judged as a historian rather than as an interdisciplinary researcher. Or the professor's field may be "community development" but his doctoral degree was in anthropology. He may well be judged as an anthropologist rather than as a community developer.

Another problem arises from the fact that publications "in the scholarly and critical literature" are given emphasis, with textbooks, reports, circulars, et cetera, being of value (as part of the evaluation of the candidate's "creative work") only in so far as they "present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research." This opens the door to the practice of ignoring publications directed towards a non-academic audience or of subtly downgrading them. This will be discussed below more fully, but I would only ask here: Why shouldn't all publications, regardless of medium, be equally evaluated on the basis of "new ideas" and "scholarly research?" Why set up an implied ranking which is unnecessary if the internal quality of such works is supposedly always considered?

Unfortunately many of the terms used, such as "new ideas," "creative work," "recognized," "scholarly," et cetera, are ambiguous and subject to various interpretation. Furthermore, other considerations, such as class and culture, intervene.

In a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural society it is important that cultural and ethnic subjectivism be recognized as an influence on any review process where one or more persons (of one culture) may judge one (or more) persons of another culture. The academic world has, generally, accepted the principle of "judgement by peers." This is doubtless a good system in general, but it can be subject to abuse when a minority person may find that he has, in fact, no "peer" (from his perspective, at least) on the review committee. In this connection, "peer" can be defined both as someone of the candidate's ethnic group (if at all pertinent to the field) and someone drawn from the actual field of the candidate. (I have served on review committees where, in fact, there was no person from the candidate's field even when that field was not just an "area of study" but actually organized as an academic unit. Theoretically this is not supposed to happen, but since such committees are "secret" it is difficult to discover and/or correct any such problem unless one is a member of the committee).

A principle which may reflect class and ethnic bias relates to the differentiation between publications designed for an academic audience (the "scholarly and critical literature") and so-called "popular" publications. This can be expressed in another way: the highest type of writing (or creative work, but especially writing) is that which is intended for a "scholarly" audience, that is, for other academics or other professors in one's own field of specialization. Of course, it is meritorious if a specialized work of "high calibre" attracts a wider audience and becomes a "monumental" work, but such cases are rare. It is enough that the article, report, monograph, review, essay or book is "recognized" as having value by the other specialists in a given "discipline."

Now we must bear in mind that an "again-searcher" who wishes to communicate his results has many choices as to form of communication and target-audience. He can, for example, publish an article on the "Early Western Apache, 1300-1700" in a historical journal (as I have) which is read by no Western Apaches or few, if any, school teachers, social workers, etc., who work with Apaches. Such an article, even if of potential practical significance, will be buried and forgotten. Almost never will a curriculum-developer or school textbook-writer or teacher ever see the article, and the result will be that factual data on certain aspects of Apache history will remain unknown and the children will continue, for years, to be taught inaccurate, biased information.

On the other hand, I could have chosen to publish the article in Apache newspapers, or I could have mimeographed it and sent it to teachers or I could have conveyed the data to people directly at Indian meetings or teacher workshops. In such a way the results of my "again-searching" could actually be of use to an oppressed people struggling to overcome sterotypes and control their own self-definitions.

In the University of California, however, my article published in a historical quarterly will be counted as a publication. It will be assigned a number, a copy will

be duly placed in my file, and it will be examined (perhaps) at promotion time. If the journal is "prestigious" it will help my cause greatly no matter how good the article really is; but if the journal is little-known it will help my case only if it is well-footnoted, etcetera. An article published in an "irregular" format (newspaper, popular magazine, mimeographed etc.) or a lecture delivered to a "lay" audience, though, will not be given a number or will be regarded as essentially a non-publication.

Cases are talked of in the University of California where the publication of "popular" articles, textbooks, and other "non-scholarly" works actually detracted from the possibility of promotion. In any event, mimeographed works and newspaper articles generally do not count, that much is clear!

Nowadays I hear frequently the refrain: "was it published in a refereed journal." This, of course, is the highest type of academic elitism. An article, no matter how carefully prepared or well-researched, is judged by whether or not the journal in which it is published uses a system of circulating it among a group of readers. The readers' collective judgement determines whether the article is ultimately published or not.

So we have a system in which articles are supposed to be written for other professors to read and they are given the highest rating when they are sent to journals which have a group of professors who predetermine which articles the rest of the professors get to see.

Whether "refereed" journals are really "better" than non-refereed journals is an issue, but one which I think is of little significance. The real question is: why should "again-searchers" write for other professors? A second question is, why can't other professors read Apache newspapers (if they are looking for knowledge about Apaches)?

Articles written for "popular" media are considered to be "non-scholarly." But as I have already shown "scholarly" simply means "school-one-ly" (or "the way school-people do things"). So what is it that we really seek in the publications of faculty? "New ideas" or "insights?" "New knowledge?" Wisdom, maybe? The reporting of the results of "again-searching?" If the latter come close to what we expect, then the form of communication is obviously of no significance except in so far as it is important in relation to reaching a particular audience.

Native American people have a very strong tradition of oral literature. Perhaps it would, threfore, be very appropriate for certain products to be in the form of audio-casettes rather than printed as articles. Films and video-tapes are also possible forms. On the other hand, outside of art and architecture, the audio-visual forms of expression are associated with a "primitive" stage of social evolution (in itself a completely deductive and biased assumption). Prejudice aside, the use of audio-casettes seems to me to be an excellent publishing format. (I can even conceive of the speaker placing his footnotes orally, and listing his sources, at the end of the tape.)

In the People's Republic of China it is, reportedly, considered to be of some significance that the results of "again-searching" reach potential users and that the "masses" and the "professors" move forward together. The "common people" are considered to be the possessors of valuable wisdom or knowledge, in many cases, and competent to criticize the work of professors. In this way, the university serves the people (in theory) rather than elite groups.

The University of California also believes that the results of "again-searching" should be made available to "users" and that "criticism" (feedback) should come from non-professors, but primarily when the "users" and "critics" are part of the ruling structure. In agriculture, for example, the "users" are largely corporate growers or large-scale farmers and the "feed-back" also comes from these same groups (partly in the form of very significant money-contributions which the Division of Agricultural Sciences receives regularly from chemical corporations and grower associations).

The fact that a University of California professor recently perfected a mechanical lettuce-picking machine for the primary purpose of helping large lettuce-growers break strikes by farm-workers (as reported in his own words in the newspapers) is not at all surprising. It is a good example of the kind of user-orientation and response-to-feedback practiced by the University.

Now, is this pattern (of the U.C. agricultural sciences) different from the pattern followed by other fields of the University? Not really. The guiding principle, it seems, is that the University does not serve any target-audience except professors unless (1) money is involved, and (2) the users are governmental agencies or powerful elements of the ruling industrial-corporate elite. An article written for Indians may be considered "non-scholarly" but a report for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, a Lake Tahoe Regional Authority, or the U.S. Forest Service may well be acceptable.

The policy used to judge the published works of the faculty is, in short, nothing but an expression of the class bias (and ethnic bias) of the University as a whole. And this is not merely because of the way in which differential treatment is accorded "reports" according to whether they are going to "common people" or to establishment bureaucrats. It is also because the "professors write for other professors" rule is part of the creation of an elite closed system wherein "knowledge" is "owned" by professors in a particular discipline and it is not to be shared except in a certain manner. It is a subtle thing, but basically is as follows: professors in a discipline usually have only one means of earning a living, as a teacher-researcher in a particular field. They thus have a vested interest in maintaining a somewhat closed-circle, veiled in mystery by magic words. The Laity is supposed to remain in awe of this circle of mysterious knowledge, protected by a wall of jargon which they have not learned to translate into English.

When professors communicate primarily with other professors they not only "conspire" to help each other get a jump on the outsiders but they also perfect (or constantly enlarge) their jargon. Of course, they also specifically help each other's research, since many projects merely build upon someone else's previous work. In any case, they make it difficult for the non-specialist to understand what they are up to, and they insure their continued employment at least as "translators."

The results of this kind of work may occasionally be shared with the public but only with the public as audience, never as collaborator-critic. And that is the essential rule: the masses are not to be dealt with as equals but as inferiors.

In this syndrome, of course, we have another manifestation of the elitist European tradition of looking down upon "the people." It is also part and parcel of the colonialism experienced by Native Americans, Chicanos, blacks etcetera, who are always to be studied by "experts" who then are called in by the government to develop policy. The role of ex-professor Daniel Moynihan comes to mind, but he is, of course, only one of thousands of white academics who make their livings because they are "supposed" to have "expertise" about this or that non-White (or poor) population.

The doctrine of "writing for other professors" is not, then, an innocent quirk of academia. It is part of a system of class exploitation and inter-ethnic imperialism. It is not necessarily productive of "new knowledge" and especially it is not productive of wisdom. In many cases, in fact, the incestuous relationship of professors has corrupted areas of knowledge and led to the perpetuation of errors, biases, and sheer ignorance.

For example, anthropologists and historians especially have been studying Indians for years, but the anthropologists and historians usually do not read each other's works and neither ordinarily involve Native People in their respective closed circles (except as "informants"). What are the results, after all, of these many decades of study?

(1) Most textbooks (at all levels) are still heavily biased against Native People, including many written by "high-prestige" professors;

(2) Fact after fact of significance is not "known" or is never incorporated in syntheses;

(3) Major assumptions held by the professors are in error (as, for example, the whole anthropological conception of Navajo and Apache history which has never incorporated the rich data found in Navajo and Apache oral traditions, traditions of epic proportions and great complexity).

Another excellent example of the harmful effect of academic incest can be seen in the discipline of psychology. Psychology, as it has evolved in U.S. universities,

is in great part, European middle-class or upper-class in origin. It's supposedly "universal" or "general" theories and "laws" are, in fact, often based upon European cultural characteristics and some of it's concepts are without empirical basis. Native American psychology (now belatedly being recognized by a few anthropologists and practicing psychiatrists) has never been allowed to contribute to the "discipline" of psychology, nor has the wisdom of Asia and Africa (by and large).

An example of cultural bias is illustrated by the concept of the "unconscious," a term used frequently by some psychologists to "explain" dreams, visions, motivations, etcetera. Unfortunately, "unconscious" simply means "not known" (or "that which I am not aware of.") To say that one can explain a dream by saying that it "comes from" the "not known" is, of course, an absurdity. Nonetheless, Native People's wide use of dreaming as a source of knowledge and insight is disregarded and, in fact, denigrated.

In any event, I do not believe that writing exclusively for other professors advances the cause of knowledge, generally speaking. Over-all, the proof of this is to be seen in the biased, racist nature of higher education in the United States, a result certainly inconsistent with the production of "new insights" and "new knowledge."

After many years of effort certain non-publishing fields such as music, art, architecture, drama, etcetera, came to be accepted in U.S. universities. Here "creative" efforts result in the production of "objects," or "performances," etcetera. To be acceptable, however, such end results of creative effort must usually be part of European or European-American culture and, perferably, associated with upper-class values. Thus symphonic music, opera, chamber music, and other strictly European forms are accepted while jazz, traditional American Indian music, calypso, etcetera, are not (except in a few "ethno-musicology" programs where "ethnic" music can be studied). Similarly, sculpture and painting which fits in with the evolution of European art is acceptable while Native American painting, sculpture, basketry, etc., is not.

The absurdity of this approach is easy to see. One can pick up almost any work on Native art (such as Art of the Great Lakes Indians published by the Flint, Michigan, Institute of Art in connection with a special showing of American art) and see incredibly interesting, unique, and well-made objects, equal to what is produced by Europeans (and especially by "modern" art professors on some campuses).

Ah, but American art (except for some sculpture and painting) tends to be connected with the production of utilitarian objects (spoons, baskets, pipes, boxes, clothing, rugs, etcetera) and that which is utilitarian is "out," probably because it smacks of the lower-classes! Also Native Americans are said, by anthropologists, to be "primitives" and their art is classified as "primitive art." It is considered to be something which should be studied by art students in a course on comparative art, or the history of art, but it is certainly not something they should learn in a University of California department of art, and especially not from a living practioner!

"Primitive" means, of course, "early" or, specifically, "early in the sequence of human evolution." Quite clearly it would be strange for a college run by white Europeans, who are obviously "the latest stage of human evolution," to be teaching the arts and music of people who are a living "throw-back," as it were, or survivors, of "early man!" But, of course, this attitude is only another illustration of the deep, pervasive cultural and ethnic bias found among white academics and it is no joke!

In any event, cultural and class bias extends far beyond simply subsidizing European art forms to the exclusion of others. The theory behind which creative efforts are to be accepted as products and which are not also operates against the poor and the non-white.

The University long ago learned to accept creative efforts of faculty for purposes of promotion, so long as these creative efforts resulted in products or performances acceptable to European upper-class culture or, in the case of engineering, agricultural science, etc., to White economic interests. But outside of established fields "applied" products are frowned upon. A painting exhibited or a symphony performed do not, in and of themselves, contribute to any "theory-building." They are applied objects or processes, to be performed or observed for what they are. "Theory" may be developed later but doubtless not by the artist or composer. Some art historian or musicologist is more likely to analyze the product than is the original producer.

Nonetheless, the product, as above, will be accepted. But what if a Native American faculty member applies his or her experience, methodology, and/or knowledge to the creation of a totally new, complex product - a native - controlled university? (Or it could be an Indian-controlled legal service program, or an Americanist school, or an all-Indian education organization designed to bring about changes in the entire educational process.)

The answer would be, "we need a report, some kind of written document analyzing the process of development and helping to build general theory in that area "before such a creative, applied effort could be given a number and put in one's promotion file. Why? Does the painter need a report on each of his exhibitions? Does he need to analyze the reaction of the audience, or the politics of getting paintings exhibited? No, indeed, the exhibition is enough (as reflected in his file by photographs and, perhaps, copies of the exhibition announcement).

A "commmunity developer," "applied social scientist," or "educational specialist" can, of course, easily produce photographs of his "products," along with (usually) a multitude of concrete reports, proposals, position papers, speeches, etc., used in the development process. These could, most certainly, provide adequate documentation showing the nature of the creative, applied effort. But, at present, they are not collected, are not asked for, are not welcome, and would not be understood. In fact, one's chairman might ask "why have you been spending so much time on community service when you need to write a book?"

"Public or community service" is the category where the University faculty places all community-related activities whether they consist in a complex developmental process or membership on the local city recreation committee. But, of course, "development" is not mere "service," especially when it involves the application of "theory," expertise, accumulated knowledge, etc., to a complex problem.

Problem-solving is usually at the heart of "again-searching." And problem-solving is, of course, very acceptable to the University so long as the "problem" is of little significance to anyone (as "who really wrote Shakespeare's plays") or, if of significance, is seen as a priority by the ruling society (i.e., the "feds" or some corporation is willing to put up the money to have it solved). Unless the government is willing to subsidize problem-solving it should be carried out in the library or in a laboratory and not in the "real world."

But this is not wholly correct. A problem can be dealt with in the "real world" so long as its solution does not threaten the wealthy or the powerful, so long as its results can be "written up," and so long as the process is viewed as an "experiment" rather than a an actual, non-experimental, process.

It is all right to "experiment" on an Indian community, so that one can write up a detailed report for Human Organization (or some other "theoretical-descriptive" journal). It is quite a different matter, however, to be a part of an Indian community participating with the people in a change process. Yet this latter approach is the only one (in my opinion) supported by community development theory and the only one likely to yield success. It also is an approach often ruling out more than a perfunctory report because detailed analysis might threaten the viability of the new change or development (leading to factional fights, for example, or to destruction by hostile forces).

In any event, it seems clear to me that the intellectual process involved and the resulting intrinsic value of products created are much the same whether the problem-solving and/or creative act takes place in the library, laboratory, or community. The over-all goal of the University is supposedly the discovery of "new knowledge." Quite clearly, much "new knowledge" arises in any complex developmental process. The product or process itself is the manifestation or actualization of that "new knowledge." It can be shared with others in several ways: by viewing or participating in the product (as when one views an art object, hears a symphony, or observes a school); by teaching others about such processes, as in the University classroom; by going on to work on even more complex or different-but-related projects; or by giving lectures, writing reports, or producing books about the "new knowledge."

Not everyone wants to, or is capable of, carrying out community development or other "applied" projects. Similarly, not everyone wants to, or is capable of, writing

books which people will read (or which can be published). For example, there is certainly a place for people who study what others do (that is, people who study social change as non-participants) but this is not community development and such people are not developers. The community developer should not have to become another kind of person in order to receive legitimacy.

Similarly, those in education who study about education but who never have the experience of actually initiating or implementing any educational concept are not educators nor are they educational developers. We need University faculty in the education area who actually are involved in the change process. "Observation" of "experimental" classrooms is not the same as actually working with a community to help them develop a new school, curricula, or what-have-you. The "controlled," "experimental" setting yields one kind of data, while a development process which is not controllable (which reflects, in fact, the actual school situation) is able to yield other kinds of data.

The University is already involved heavily in research of the same order as that described, but, again, it is at Livermore, or Los Alamos, or Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, or in agricultural sciences, or deals with environmental pollution, etc., and is subsidized by, and accepted by, the sources of money. Similarly, the University does accept novels, poems, book reviews, paintings, plays, lettuce-picking machines, tough-skinned tomatoes, etcetera, as legitimate products, but it does not usually accept "applied" creative products which relate to the oppressed, the non-white, the "powerless," and the poor (unless, as indicated, the product conforms to an elitist method and is supplemented by additional products of a written nature). The applied researcher is, therefore, burdened by having to produce two products in a manner similar to a University poet having to produce his poems and then a book about the poems too!

Many non-whites do not wish to have their "scholarship" restricted to an intra-academic or academic-government-corporate system. They wish to include their communities within the circle of research, creativity, and application. Perhaps also they believe in the concept of the spiral of theory-action-theory-action etcetera which, for them, also is specialist-community-specialist-community, etcetera, in a never-ending process of mutually supportive interaction.

Many minority faculty are part of populations which are also oppressed and colonialized. This is, indeed, a relevant consideration, since: (1) it should be the right of every faculty person to remain a part of his ethnic group (if he so wishes); and (2) it is his right to do work which will be useful to his own people.

It should be emphasized that much of what white professors do, from experimenting on captive animals, to studying space science, to writing reviews of Faulkner's novels, is selected out of the great number of possible research activities not on a purely random basis but because the white population or government supports such work with contracts or grants or at least deems it important. It would be naive to believe that the majority of white professors select research topics without regard to priorities given by white-controlled agencies or outside of the values of their own ethnic group. I have been privy to too many conversations about "grantsmanship" and "who will publish what" to believe that all professors are, in fact, free-wheeling, independent "scholars."

But what is useful to, and supported by, powerful white agencies and affluent white communities is often very different from what is useful to oppressed and low-income groups. True "academic freedom" must include the opportunity for non-white faculty to "be themselves" and be true to their own peoples.

In August 1969, the University of California adopted the principle that appointment and promotion committees are required to give "explicit recognition" to the "concept of professional integrity of an individual faculty member." In 1976 this principle was reemphasized by the Davis campus Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Leon Mayhew, and a copy of the American Association of University Professor's "Statement on Professional Ethics" was circulated to tenured faculty appointed to such committees. The AAUP position is that:

> the professor, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognizes the special responsibilities placed upon him. His primary responsibility to his subject is to seek and to state the truth as he sees

it....[As reproduced by memoranda of the Office of the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Davis campus, August 25, 1976; italics added.]

"Academic freedom" then must include the right of the non-white academic to seek and to state the truth as he sees it.

The implications of this idea are profound indeed since the concept of seeking and stating the truth must refer not only to the content of the effort but also to the means utilized for such expression. And by means we must include not only the methodology of discovery or creation but also the vehicle used for the dissemination of findings.

For example, if it is integral to my theory of knowledge-building that the Native American masses be involved in their own intellectual development and that I must present my findings to them as an essential step in my own spiral of intellectual growth (e.g., that the "feedback" from Indian people is an essential method of "testing" theories and proceeding to a higher-level of validity), then part of my method of "seeking" truth is to write for, or communicate with, a "non-scholarly" audience.

Similarly, if I am concerned with communicating "truths" about Native American religious freedom (or the lack of it) and the relevant law on that subject, I might choose to write an article for a theoretical journal on the manner in which the First Amendment rights of Native Americans are or have been violated. But such an article would (generally speaking) only share such knowledge with people who are not going to do a thing to change illegal practices. So instead I have chosen to prepare a handbook for Native People, incorporating the results of research but translating that knowledge into concrete litigation and legislative strategy.

My theory of "stating the truth" means, in short, that I have a right to state the "truth" to those who need to hear the "truth" because they have long been denied access to data necessary for bringing an end to the oppression distorting their lives. In short, my freedom to "state the truth" must include the freedom to select how I will do so. Otherwise, we run the risk of subscribing to a policy of being able to "state the truth" only in the privacy of one's own living room, or in publications of limited circulation, or only to a predetermined audience.

"Academic freedom," of course, is also a mockery if one is not allowed into the University at all, if one is coerced as a lecturer or assistant professor, if one is forced to adopt alien cultural styles and values, and if one is expected to turn one's back on one's own people. And what should be the nature of "academic freedom" and "faculty self-government" in an institution already controlled by one race or by one tradition? If the controlling group will not voluntarily open the doors of departments and colleges to other perspectives and other ethnic goups then what avenues are open to the excluded ones? If minorities try to use the power of the state or of the federal government to desegregate the University they are threatening the "academic freedom" of the Europeanists. If they resort to strikes, picketing, demonstrations, etcetera, they are obviously wild, unruly "partisans" whose entrance into Academia will distort its tranquility and "dispassionate objectivity."

Thus the oppressed and left-out are supposed to act like the Native peón waiting for his patrón to grant him equality. And, of course, as we all know it takes a very, very, long time for a peón to earn the right to be equal with the finquero.

Wisdom and New Knowledge

The ancient Mexicans described the tlamatini (wise man or philosopher-teacher) as follows:

> The wise man: a light, a torch, a stout torch that does not smoke.
> A perforated mirror, a mirror pierced on both sides.
> His are the black and red ink, his are the illustrated manuscripts, he studies the illustrated manuscripts.
> He himself is writing and wisdom.
> He is the path, the true way for others.

He directs people and things; he is a guide in human affairs.
The wise man is careful (like a physician) and preserves tradition.
His is the handed-down wisdom; he teaches it; he follows the path of truth.
Teacher of the truth, he never ceases to admonish.
He makes wise countenances of others; to them he gives a face (a reliable personality); he leads them to develop it.
He opens their ears; he enlightens them.
He is the teacher of guides; he shows them their path.
One depends upon him.
He puts a mirror before others; he makes them prudent, cautious; he causes a face to appear in them.
He attends to things; he regulates their path, he arranges and commands.
He applies his light to the world.
He knows what is above us (and) in the region of the dead.
He is a serious man.
Everyone is comforted by him, corrected, taught.
Thanks to him people humanize their will and receive a strict education.
He comforts the heart, he comforts the people, he helps, gives remedies, heals everyone. [León-Portilla, Aztec Thought and Culture, pp. 10-11.]

One can clearly see that the tlamatini is not only concerned with knowing or discovering facts (although his title means "one who knows things"). He is also expected to be like a physician, not a physician of the physical body alone but of the total human personality. More especially, his primary role is to help persons to develop as wise, authentic, harmonious human beings.

The modern university, unlike the Mexican calmécac, has all too often become a place where "research" and the production of "new knowledge" has become so important that wisdom has all but disappeared as an attribute, let alone concern with the full development of human personality.

Unfortunately, "new knowledge" can include such things as how to kill greater numbers of people, how to use drugs in order to control behavior and (among other things) obtain information from detained individuals, how to artificially create human beings, how to put men out of work, how to better understand given ethnic groups in order to control them more efficiently, how to develop a new pesticide with dangerous side effects, how to steal rain clouds from one region in order to benefit another area, and so on, ad infinitum. The production of "new knowledge" was avidly sponsored by the Nazis, is well supported in the Soviet Union, and is subsidized in the U.S. by such dubious agencies as the C.I.A., the Department of Defense, and the California Growers Association.

"New knowledge," as such, can be good, bad, dangerous, horrible, delightful, liberating, enslaving, or just plain "so what." We need to try to find some other main purpose or purposes for the University (if it is not too naïve to say so).

I, frankly, do not believe that the general public, or perhaps even the legislators, have any notion of how far universities have departed from being institutions of "learning" and "ideas" and have become instead centers for the development of "products" desired by government and industry. In fact, many universities are almost large-scale RAND corporations - Stanford Research Institutes - Lockheed Research Divisions with students and classes attached as something of an appendage.

We are very close to being part of a factory, with the "productivity" of the faculty (and of countless technicians, assistants, etcetera) being the raison d' etre of the institution; and, as indicated earlier, this "productivity" is closely linked to the needs of government and corporate industry both as to funding, character, and use.

This is what makes the quest for "new knowledge" often so questionable. The "new knowledge" desired by NASA, the CIA, the Department of Defense, the pesticide industry, corporate agriculture, the Department of Justice, etcetera, is overwhelmingly not "knowledge" of the "old-fashioned" intellectual, personal, or aesthetic kind. On the contrary, it is the knowledge of how to do something very specific which can be directly or indirectly translated into, perhaps, a weapon, a population-control device, or a profit-making tool. But most significantly of all, many of these "products" cannot be used by minority groups, the general public, small farmers, organic farmers, consumers, or low-income people. But they can be used by the already powerful, by groups, in short, who can implement new programs right now. Thus, if a new concept in weaponry

or weather-control comes out of a federally-financed research program, the federal government has the money, power, and apparatus necessary for rapidly making the "ideas" over into hard objects or actual programs (such as the "H-Bomb" and "weather modification").

Furthermore, many federally-funded research programs relating to the biological-medical spectrum involve experimentation on, and often the death of, countless animals held in captivity. The University of California is heavily involved in such research, some of it of a relatively ethically neutral form (such as simply observing mice in cages), and some of it of a very questionable character (at least from a Native American or "reverence for life" perspective). How do faculty in the arts and humanities, dedicated as they are (theoretically) to the "finer" side of man's sensibilities, reconcile their values with the (often) acres of captive experimental animals to which many students are exposed as a part of their "liberal" education?

Federal money is available for experimentation on animals, and so, whether for good or ill, the University is in the game.

Are there any ethical limits on the means one uses for gaining "new knowledge?" Are there any limits to what kind of "new knowledge" one is willing to produce? Are there any limits as to what kind of government, and for what purposes of government, one is willing to "again-search?"

These are not questions which I propose to answer. In fact I have gone into this discussion only to illustrate <u>what I believe is the ultimate purpose of the University, namely to foster the development of the kind of wisdom and unhampered truth-seeking which is the only thing capable of saving our world from, among other things, the mad technicians who are, in great numbers at least, willing to be the servants of any government or power able to pay their way</u>.

I am not sure I know what "wisdom" is. It is not the same as "knowledge" because perhaps it can be said that "there are things which it is wise <u>not</u> to know." "Wisdom" is perhaps one of those words which cannot be precisely defined, but I think it is maybe a state of "knowing" or "seeing" which is superior to ordinary "knowledge." That is, to be wise is not necessarily to "know" anything in particular but rather it is to "know" about "knowing" and "not-knowing," about "feeling" and "inspiration," about "love" and "hate," about "happiness" and "pain," and, in short, about the interrelatedness of life and of the "things" in life.

Many professors (and other people) are "knowledgable" ("experts!") but are not wise. Universities have a lot of knowledge but do they have much wisdom? When a university learns that millions are available for "educational research" from the feds (or can be lobbied out of the U.S. Office of Education by means of a bit of "persuasion") is it wise to go after that money and establish (for example) a "Center for Research in Education?" Certainly, the center (or any other "center") can generate impressive over-head for the trustees to allocate, and perhaps it can enhance some professor's research productivity, but what about the distortion of the university's over-all character by the presence of such well-staffed non-teaching divisions? What about the loss of independence that comes from getting used to eating Uncle Sam's fodder? And what about the people's tax dollars diverted into a purpose which, in fact, they know nothing about? And, finally, will such a "center" yield anything that is relevant to "wisdom?"

Let me state also that I know full well that the battle for federal funds often leads to illegal and ethically-questionable tactics on the part of professors, universities, and research corporations who seek to secure "favorite-son" (non-competitive) contracts or otherwise "wheel and deal" to keep federal dollars flowing. Is that wise? Is it in keeping with the "mission" of a "fine" institution? Or is it no different from a college president trying to raise money from an ethically-tarnished but wealthy corporate figure for, say, a new gymnasium or an auditorium.

In any case, "wisdom" is something which the feds, the chemical industry, and the California Council on Criminal Justice, among others, are not willing to pay for. It is, on the other hand probably the quality most admired and sought after by Native Americans in former generations (as well as by many Asian cultures, traditional African cultures, and so on). If the University is to be at all relevant to non-European cultures it must leave room for "wise men" to be a part of it.

University President David S. Saxon of the University of California has stated that:

> The fundamental missions of institutions of higher education are the pursuit and preservation of both knowledge and wisdom, and the enlargement and transmission of both...." [California Aggie, Oct. 7, 1975, p. 1].

It is very laudable that "wisdom" is recognized as a goal of the University by President Saxon, but what happens when the generation of new knowledge comes into conflict with wisdom? Further, what means does the University take to encourage the development of "wisdom?" Finally, why is non-White "wisdom" only very belatedly and hesitantly being allowed a share in University budgeting?

On a more practical level, it is very clear that Socrates (to name one "wise man") could not get tenure as a professor in the University of California (except that the University does respect fame and as a famous man Socrates might possibly get in). Many Native American "wise men" (of which there are a number) could not even receive a Regent's Professorship (temporary) at the University, or a guest lectureship. The best we could ordinarily do, I am sure, is to scrape up $25 to $100 (perhaps) for a day's visit as a "one-shot" speaker.

"Wisdom" is, clearly, difficult to evaluate for promotion purposes. Perhaps, in fact, one encourages the development of wisdom not be making it a part of the promotion process, which would tend to have the effect of forcing professors to go around trying to appear "wise," but rather by deemphasizing those things which distort the University environment.

The pressure to "publish or perish," for instance, is not conducive to either careful research or deep reflection. Most researchers are aware, I believe, that it is possible to put together a "technically well-researched" book or article, full of footnotes or references to statistical charts, which in fact, is not of great value. Narrowness of vision, ethnic or class bias, single-discipline exclusiveness, arbitrary definition of concepts, limited definition of the problem, or ignoring potential sources of data are all means whereby the value of a given product can be reduced greatly. On the other hand, peer evaluators may not know what data has been ignored or may, in fact, share the narrow assumptions or biases of the investigator.

I believe that what we should really be looking for, in our younger faculty at least, is not so much "productivity" as evidence of originality, independence, creativeness, insight, and understanding. These kinds of qualities can, I believe, be seen in a small number of "products," and they do not have to be in "top" journals. (In fact, I know personally that original ideas may doom an article to being published in "second-rate" journals). Papers presented orally and even insightful teaching can be sufficient for judging the "potential" of a young professor, in my opinion.

It seems to me that the truly inspirational thinkers, the "seminal" minds, and the setters of new trends in the arts are often, if not usually, people of very original, independent, and even iconoclastic bent. Similarly, it seems to me that "wisdom" arises from the maturing of an independent-minded person who is not, or has ceased to be, a pimp for anyone else.

Carlos Castaneda, then a UCLA doctoral candidate, asked Juan Matus (the Yaqui nagualli) if they were not "equals." Juan replied: no, I am a warrior and you are a pimp.

Unfortunately, the present rather rigid product-oriented mentality often selects and/or produces students who are pimps and faculty who are pimps. That is, they both must conform to paths prescribed either by other people or by a bureaucratic structure. Can such paths result in "seminal" thinking? Can they result in "wisdom?" If you are a university professor ask yourself honestly: how many "wise men" are in your department? Who would you go to on the campus if you were seeking to find a man with "wisdom?" What are you doing in your department to allow or encourage your students to be "free" ("independent") men and women?

One of the characteristics which I tend to associate with "wisdom" is "humility." Juan Matus has, I believe, ably illustrated the significance of "humility" in the following:

> I'm not a master, I'm only a warrior. So I really don't know what a master feels like. . A warrior takes his lot, whatever it may be, and accepts it in ultimate humbleness. He accepts in humbleness what he is, not as grounds for regret but as a living challenge.
>
> It takes time for everyone of us to understand that point and fully live it. I, for instance, hated the...word 'humbleness.' I'm an Indian and we Indians have always been humble and have done nothing else but lower our heads....[But] I know now that the humbleness of a warrior is not the humbleness of a beggar. The warrior lowers his head to no one, but at the same time, he doesn't permit anyone to lower his head to him. The beggar, on the other hand, falls to his knees at the drop of a hat and scrapes the floor for anyone he deems higher; but at the same time, he demands that someone lower than him scrape the floor for him.
>
> That's why I told you earlier that I didn't understand what masters felt like. I know only the humbleness of a warrior, and that will never permit me to be anyone's master. [Carlos Castaneda, Tales of Power, pp. 16,27].

Tragically, a great many college professors (and other "gurus") want to be "masters" and not "warriors." They want their students and junior colleagues to bow down before them. More significantly still, they are caught up in a publish or perish, competitive system which forces them to be aggressive and self-assertive. Can any one imagine a more obnoxious group (in all frankness) than a thousand psychologists, perhaps, or anthropologists, or other academics gathered together at an annual meeting? True, many of the people present are not agressive or self-centered but permeating the atmosphere of many such meetings is the self-promotion being desperately (although sometimes suavely) carried on by young job-seekers, professors looking for better jobs, professors seeking "influential contacts" for the future, organizational politicians looking for election and recognition, and, often, the pseudo-brilliant presenting pedantic papers in their best academese or serving as "learned" commentators (in sessions arranged by their friends or "influential contacts" from earlier conferences).

> One day I found out that personal history was no longer necessary for me and, like drinking, I dropped it....Self-importance is another thing that must be dropped, just like personal history. [Juan Matus, in Castaneda, Journey to Ixtlan, pp. 29, 41.]

If a proper "humility" is one aspect of "wisdom" how can that be developed in an atmosphere which breeds self-assertion and self-serving pseudo-scholarly activities?

We must, in short, ask ourselves this: if the cultivation of wisdom is one of the truly important missions of higher education why is it that so much of what is done in the university is counter-productive to this goal? Or are we kidding ouselves. Maybe we had best leave "wisdom" to the old Indian elders, to those non-conformists out in the hills, to the old people shut up in retirement homes, to the iconoclasts who can't get a job, to those rare turned-on and tuned-in preachers, humanitarians, and self-sacrificing people working out in the streets, or in the jungle, or in the ghetto to help a few human lives to survive and be whole.

Can we, in all honesty, say that "wisdom" is one of the University's products? If we cannot, then, we had best curtail the power of the University because knowledge without wisdom is not a "public service."

Looking to the Future

The Constitution of the United States requires that all state agencies, including universities, provide "equal protection of the laws." Can there be "equal protection" when social classes, cultural traditions, and a race are favored by the university while at the same time a substantial proportion of the population is denigrated or excluded thereby? The Constitution of the State of California flatly prohibits the favoring of one group or social class over another by state action, and now specifically requires the university to serve all ethnic heritages.

In violation of these legal requirements higher education has, over the years, arbitrarily favored certain social classes, language groups, and cultures in its student admission, hiring, and educational policies. Today, except for a pitifully small percentage of "special admits," the University of California says (in effect) that it will desegregate admissions but only if the non-white or low-income student does "A" work in a culturally-biased high school, or only if he scores well on a test whose cultural and class bias has been alleged. In short, if the student has mastered white European cultural skills and has middle or upper-class values he can get in.

Similarly prospective faculty are examined (as outlined earlier) for behavior acceptable to European upper-class values.

I do not believe that "equal protection" means that an Indian will receive "equal protection" only when he ceases to be an Indian. I do not believe that a Chicano should receive "equal protection" only when he becomes primarily English-speaking. If I am correct, then, "affirmative action" must go far beyond the mere counting of colored bodies on the campus.

How can we deal with the issues raised by this essay? Here are a few tasks which must, in my opinion, be undertaken.

First, entrance requirements and all entrance-type examinations (freshman, graduate record, etcetera) must be carefully evaluated by ethnically and culturally diverse teams to identify all requirements and tests which are culturally-biased or favor one social class over another.

Second, the use of all entrance tests for which there is evidence of cultural or class bias must be suspended and replaced by tests appropriate to a supposedly democratic society.

Third, special task forces of the faculty and administration (perhaps with student participation) should be established on each campus, and system-wide, to deal with questions of racial bias, cultural bias, sexism, and class bias in each key area of university life, including hiring policies, promotion policies, university goals, languages of instruction, counseling services, and so on. These task forces should be instructed to probe for that kind of subtle bias which, for example, allows a department to avoid hiring minority faculty by arbitrarily writing up position descriptions in sub-fields which are unlikely to produce minority candidates. (Thus, if a department is really desirous of meaningfully relating to the Chicano community they can write the position description so as to emphasize experience in, say, community development with Chicanos, or requiring bilingual and bi-cultural skills, or expertise in relation to the Chicano child or family, etcetera. If, on the other hand, they do not wish to hire a Chicano they can emphasize some type of methodology or sub-area which, because, perhaps, of its nature would not usually be selected by a Chicano for his specialty).

Similarly, task forces should probe counseling services for mono-lingualism, class bias, and, for example, whether or not the professional counseling staff is comprised solely or predominantly of persons oriented towards European psychological theory.

Fourth, the university must reexamine its policies relating to architecture, murals, language of signs and brochures, athletic programs, names of buildings and streets, decoration of offices, health service staffing, and so on, to see if, in these areas, the university does not visibly and consistently display ethnic bias. Why should, for example, signs be only in English in southwestern states when perhaps 20% to 50% of the population prefers Spanish? Why has it taken so long for Pa-agadoway (la crosse) and even "soccer" to gain entrance to the campuses? Why are the building and street names (on many campuses) exclusively of white people? Why do many health service nurses and doctors irritate minority students? Why are the photographs, murals, and decorations displayed in most buildings solely of white people or white themes? These may, individually, be small things but, unfortunately, they reflect a larger lack of concern for cultural pluralism.

Fifth, the handicaps placed in the way of minority studies programs must be removed. Task forces may be useful in this area also, but I believe that administrators should move rapidly to remove obvious barriers. Handicaps include: (1) placing non-tenured minority faculty in white-controlled departments where they are expected to not only

develop curricula and new courses but also to publish and otherwise meet all of the "normal" demands of departments; (2) revising the requirements for promotion in a new academic field; (3) providing extra support for the development of the research potential of non-tenured minority faculty (who were, after all, often recruited at a premature stage in their career due to the shortage created by previous exclusion); (4) making sure that minority studies programs are not forced to battle constantly with hostile administrators or departments in order to survive; and (5) removing devices which are designed to discourage enrollment in new curricula.

Unfortunately, of course, task forces and "work groups" can be made to spin their wheels on reports which administrators studiously ignore. Therefore, the university, from the trustees to campus administrators, must be of a mind to truly desegregate before any of this is worthwhile. Perhaps, only law suits and federal requirements will ultimately do the job, but I would hope otherwise.

Many years ago Luther Standing Bear said:

> The white man does not understand the Indian for the reason that he does not understand America. He is too far removed from its formative processes. The roots of the tree of his life have not yet grasped the rock and soil.... The man from Europe is still a foreigner and an alien. And he still hates the man who questioned his path across the continent. But in the Indian the spirit of the land is still vested; it will be until other men are able to divine and meet its rhythm. Men must be born and reborn to belong. Their bodies must be formed of the dust of their forefather's bones. (Quoted in T. C. McLuhan, Touch the Earth, N. Y., 1971, p. 107.)

How many of our universities can honestly say that their roots have now grasped American rock and soil?